

3

C.S. 1001

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH AT
BILASPUR
W.P.NO. 3875 / 2005

Petitioner

P.R. No. 3570/05
Presented by Smt. Rakesh Anand
dated 11.8.05

Heera Lal Dhruv, Aged about 59 years
S/o Shri Ramratan Dhruv, Suspended
Head Master, Primary school Sidesar,
Block Development Kanker, Tah & Dist
:Kanker, Headquarter during
suspension at Project Administrator,
Narayanpur, R/o Village & Post -
Govindpur, Dist : Kanker-(C.G.)

Versus

Respondents

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the
Secretary Home Department of Adim
Jati Kalyan Vibhag, D.K.S Bhawan,
Raipur-(C.G)
2. The Collector, Kanker
Dist : Kanker (C.G.).
3. The Commissioner,
Tribal Development Chhattisgarh,
Dist : Raipur-(C.G.)



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226 / 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 3875/ सन् 2005-

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<u>07.09.2005</u> Mr. Rakesh Anthony, learned counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Pankaj Shrivastava, learned Panel Lawyer for the State of Chhattisgarh. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was working as Assistant Teacher at Primary School, Sidesar, District Kanker, when the suspension order was passed on 06.01.1998 on the ground that there are allegations of forgery and manipulation of the documents to mislead the government. The petitioner has filed this petition on 07.08.2005 challenging the order dated 06.01.1998 seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 06.01.1998. This Court on hearing the petitioner and perusing the records, came to the conclusion that the suspension order was passed on the basis of certain allegations which require a detailed enquiry. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to tell whether any departmental enquiry is pending against the petitioner or not. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that a criminal case has been lodged against the petitioner and challan has been filed. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has filed an application before Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal, which was dismissed on 11.01.2001. The present petition does not impugn the order passed by the Tribunal under Article 227 of the Constitution. This is an independent petition, which is filed seeking the same relief, which has been rejected by the Tribunal. In view of the above stated facts, there is no merit in this case. The petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs. Consequently, all pending applications also stand disposed of.	
Sarma		Sd/- Satish K. Agnihotri Judge